Application No. Applicant(s) 09/740,011 SERIZAWA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2141 Quang N. Nguyen All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Quang N. Nguyen. (3)Masato Higa. (4) (2) John R. Mattingly. Date of Interview: 01 March 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10-13. Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,304,980. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner and the Applicant's Representatives discussed about the prior art and the Applicant's Representatives explained the differences between the invention and the prior art. The Applicant's Representatives will file a response to point out the distinction between the invention and the prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required